DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 218 SO 000 923

AUTHOR Turner, Mary Jane
TITLE Political Science in "New Social Studies" Curricula: State of the Art -- 1970.
INSTITUTION American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 19p.; Prepared for the Political Science Education Project, American Political Science Association

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS American Government (Course); Citizenship; *Civics; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; Elementary Grades; Instructional Materials; *Political Science; Political Socialization; Politics; Projects; Public Affairs Education; Secondary Grades; Social Sciences; *Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS *New Social Studies

ABSTRACT

This paper examines trends in social science and political education since World War II; discusses some of the fundamental directions established by the new social studies curricula; and evaluates the political science component of material produced by the curriculum development projects of the 1960's. Since World War II, the study of government and politics in the U.S. has been profoundly influenced by the behavioral approach. Also, social changes, such as the effects of technological advancement, and the realization of global interdependence, forced a redefinition of the traits and competencies desirable for citizens. In response to these pressures, a number of curriculum development projects were established. Out of the totality of social science curriculum packages developed during the 1960's, 46 have been identified as including some inputs from political science. The author classifies and discusses materials in four categories: those having 1) interdisciplinary use of the social sciences; 2) a focus on a particular discipline; 3) a focus on political science; and, 4) a focus on a particular geographic area. She then analyzes and evaluates these materials in terms of the cognitive and affective goals set out by the Political Science Advisory Panel to the California Statewide Social Science Committee. (Author/JLB)

ED 062218

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY RIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Jane Turner

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

POLITICAL SCIENCE IN "NEW SOCIAL STUDIES" CURRICULA:

STATE OF THE ART--1970

Prepared for

Political Science Education Project
American Political Science Association

by

Mary Jane Turner
Political Science Education Project, APSA
University of Indiana

Teacher Education in Political Science
University of Colorado

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP 000 923

First Draft for Discussion and Criticism: Not for Quotation

POLITICAL SCIENCE IN "NEW SOCIAL STUDIES" CURRICULA:

STATE OF THE ART--1970

Much of the character and thrust of formal education in America has historically been determined by those elements of our social philosophy which were the most widely shared throughout the community. Linking early simplistic notions of a "science of society" with the idea that the study of politics could be reduced to mere technique, political education early tended to become citizenship training. Following the lead of political scientists, most teachers at all levels became moralists of political action.[1] In fact, political science as a discipline seems to have arisen in the United States to fulfill the practical task of maintaining a belief in the unity of American sentiments, and it was this presumed unity that was historically the core of civics training. This is not to argue that there is anything unworthy in the goal of national unity. It does, however, suggest that the traditional schools of American political thought prior to World War II offered little substantive social science for elementary and secondary curricula.

Four schools of thought can be identified in pre-World War II political thought. These were made up of political scientists with particular interests in philosophy, legalism, activism and reform, and the quest for scientific validity. Despite their diversity in emphases, all four groups had some common features--characteristics which were not likely to divert political science from its dull, moralizing role in citizenship education. Each group was primarily concerned with mechanical aspects of institutions rather than with processes, decision making, and behavior within these institutions. Because there was no systematic body of data or organizing group of concepts and generalizations, each group shared a common attachment to chronological and sequential developmental analysis as a way of organizing the material of the field. Each seemed to share a general distrust of deductive theories or models from which might emerge explanatory or predictive statements.[2] Curriculum material gathered from such a sterile environment did little to lead students to a productive understanding of political activity.

Behavioralism in Political Science

Fortunately for the cause of political science as a discipline and for the cause of "citizenship training" as a necessity in a democracy, the study of government and politics in the United States has, since the Second World War, been profoundly influenced by the behavioral approach. No longer are students of public affairs willing merely to chronicle past events and to speculate about the past and future. Behavioralists, as the name implies, tend to study the behavior of the participants in governmental activity as opposed to the organization of the institutions of government. They also tend to be interdisciplinary, quantitative, and scientific. Emulating the methodology and procedures of the natural sciences, the behavioral political scientist seeks to develop theories based on empirical data which will permit him to explain and predict political phenomena and to verify probabilistic generalizations which link variables to one another.[3]

Initially the emergence of behavioralism, while productive in itself, tended to divide the discipline. Already divided into autonomous subsectors--American Government, Constitutional Law and Theory, Comparative Government, and International Relations--the field was further fragmented by dichotomization of each of the subsectors into traditionalist and behavioralist camps. To further complicate the picture, many political scientists also took sides on whether they should be concerned only with "what is," or should also take stands on "what ought to be."

Fortunately, out of fragmentation and dichotomy have emerged a common set of concerns. Areas of agreement on objects of inquiry and data bases have grown, cutting across subsectors. Thus the empirical base of the discipline has been widened spatially and temporally.

"What has been termed 'the behavioral revolution' seems to be over and the rapprochment of the 'behavioral' and 'traditional' approaches is clearly discernible,"[4] so that the most productive thrusts of each are being utilized. Of equal importance has been the acceptance by normative theorists of the need for empirical data and by empirical theorists of the necessity for normative commitments.

Although political science is still in a state of transition toward firmer theoretical footings, it has already developed to a point of sophistication where it does have available conceptual tools, elementary structures, and

refined methodologies which put it in a position to participate in and contribute to creative curricular change in the social sciences.

Social Imperatives for Curriculum Change

The launching of Sputnik in 1957 spurred a dramatic revolution in the teaching of mathematics and science. Since this revolution was not soon reflected in the social science programs, there was a growing concern about the apparent imbalance in classroom emphasis.

Concern for the state of social science education was also increased by the many changes in 20th century life resulting from scientific and technological developments. New industries, such as atomic energy, and new occupations, created by the fast pace of automation, not only brought about conditions of relative affluence and increased leisure time, but also brought disturbing dislocations and inequities. As American society continued adapting its social structure to technological innovations, there was increasing centralization of power and leadership, creating new roles for government.[5] The question that became paramount in the minds of concerned Americans was whether this centralization of power and decision-making could be reconciled with autonomy for the individual. Such concerns began to force a redefinition of the traits and competencies desirable for students and citizens in a participatory society.

Also to be considered was the fact that in many important ways both national governments and their citizens function in a transnational society, or in a number of transnational societies. "This reality was also reflected in the trend toward the development of a genuine world community."[6] The existence of common problems, common perceptions, and increased facilities for cross-national communication made obsolete the old notions about autonomous nation states. The increasing interrelatedness of all the global components of man's activity made the task of understanding the world about them a formidable challenge for adolescents.

Recognition of these vital problems and issues, which intimately affect everyday life, seemed to call for greater creativity and innovation in the search for solutions. Basic value conflicts over civil rights, the right to dissent, morality, the population explosion, and depletion of natural resources, famine, disease, poverty, drug use, and the ever-present hazard of nuclear

warfare demanded resolution. As Margaret Mead noted: "We are now at the point where we must educate people in what nobody knew yesterday, and prepare in our schools for what no one knows yet, but what some people must know tomorrow."

Social Science Curriculum Projects

In response to these societal pressures, and encouraged by funding from several sources--primarily the U.S. Office of Education and the National Science Foundation--a number of curriculum materials development projects were established to bring about a transformation of both the methodology and content of elementary and secondary social studies courses.

The total picture of what had to be done was complicated by the dramatic onrush of new knowledge which characterized the fifties and sixties. What had never in reality been possible--a presentation of total knowledge--had become patently impossible in view of the amount of new data being processed daily and the speed with which one piece of information replaced another. New methods of selecting content (as opposed to the conventional wisdom supposedly embodied in "coverage of the Field"), new methods of organizing facts so that they relate to other knowledge in ways which contribute to perspective and understanding, and new ways of teaching intellectual skills had to be found and pressed into immediate service.

Using the Structures of the Disciplines

New ideas on how best to handle the knowledge explosion can be traced back to several key individuals, one of the most important of whom is Jerome Bruner, a learning theorist at Harvard University. Because his influence on the new social studies curriculum materials has been profound, any understanding of what the various curriculum development projects are attempting must begin with him.[7] Certain main themes developed by Bruner have to a large extent guided the direction which the new social studies curricula have taken.

Bruner's primary concern is with the quality and intellectual aims of education. He feels that the aims of education should be to train well-balanced citizens for a democracy and to aid each student to develop his own maximum potential.[8] The ways in which these goals can be realized are, first, by teaching

the structure of a subject or discipline rather than facts and techniques, so that viable relationships can be established which will be useful in the understanding of new information. Second, basic concepts and generalizations from all disciplines should be used, related in some way to the child's experiential frame. Finally, the desire to learn should be stimulated through the excitement of personal discovery.[9]

Understanding Value Conflicts

A second problem which confronted the curriculum builders of social studies programs was concerned with the selection of content. After exploring in depth the approaches to selecting social science content taken by the Commission of the Social Studies of the American Historical Association (1916) and the Committee on Concepts and Values of the National Council for the Social Studies (1957), and finding both schemes deficient for the purposes which they hoped to achieve, Donald Oliver of Harvard University proposed a criterion for content selection which has been employed in at least three of the major projects. Basic to the Oliver thrust is an explicit value judgment regarding the purpose of governmental functions in society. This value judgment is that each individual has a right to make personal choices regarding appropriate conduct for seeking personal fulfillment, and that a primary duty of government is to preserve that freedom of choice. Where this type of freedom is promoted and protected, it is assumed that conflict and disagreement will also exist, because different individuals see fulfillment and the mechanisms leading to fulfillment in different frames of reference.[10] When students have developed to a stage where they have a descriptive knowledge of their culture and have internalized the specific beliefs of their family or clan as well as some of the more general beliefs and values of the total society, the content of the social studies can be focused on conflicts and on differing definitions and interpretations of the meaning of liberty, freedom, equality, security, and other valued goals.[11]

Using New Knowledge About Political Socialization

Recent research in political socialization has made another important contribution to social studies. In and of themselves, these findings did not prescribe new and improved approaches to political education for elementary or secondary schools. They did, however, point to some crucial educational

problems, narrow the range of possible alternatives, and raise some very basic questions about past practices and future possibilities in political education.[12] The research has indicated that most Americans very early acquire positive and enduring supportive attitudes about the nation and the political system. However, this generalized support for the structure and ideals of a democratic nation frequently is not translated into actions and feelings among individuals and groups. Many individuals who are very supportive of democracy in the abstract do not see the implications of democracy for, as an example, their own views about minority groups and minority opinions.

It seems imperative to structure curricula which gives students an opportunity to examine critically the values inherent in the American political system and in their own personal belief system--and to resolve whatever conflicts may exist. This can be accomplished by providing young people with the tools to think about their beliefs and examine traditional practices in an educational atmosphere conducive to reflective thinking.[13]

The new knowledge about political socialization, along with other developments such as new approaches to resolving value conflicts and new ways of relating social science content to the curriculum, helped to convince social science curriculum researchers and developers of the necessity for reform in content, environment, strategy, and sought-after skills. The curriculum projects have generally attempted to develop citizenship through better understanding of intellectual and affective goals, with many relying on the excellent taxonomies of educational objectives developed by Benjamin S. Bloom,[14] and David S. Krathwohl[15], and their colleagues.

The educational aims of the new curriculum developers may be no more worthy than the goals set by the educators of the past. What has changed is the realization of what is and is not possible in developing citizenship, plus a refinement of the tools with which the desired objectives can be realized.

Curriculum Projects and Political Science

Out of the totality of social science curriculum packages which were developed during the 1960's, forty-six have been identified which include some inputs from the domain of political science. Needless to say, the materials vary in scope, level of generality, and quality. Some of the projects have produced only a few units, where others have generated very extensive sets, up to a complete

K-12 curriculum. Some of the projects have dealt primarily with individual disciplines in the social sciences; others have drawn upon many or all of the social sciences. Some of the materials were primarily designed for sequential and cumulative use, while others were developed to "plug into" traditional courses to supplement and enrich them. Some resources were developed for abler students; others specifically for average or, especially in the last two or three years, for disadvantaged youth.

We have classified and listed the forty-six materials packages in four categories: those having (1) interdisciplinary use of the social sciences, (2) focus or emphasis on a particular discipline, (3) focus or emphasis on political science, and (4) focus or emphasis on particular geographic areas.

Interdisciplinary Materials

The materials in this group are quite varied, but have the common characteristic that content from a number of the social sciences is used, without particular emphasis on any one. In general they accept the notion that common concepts, methodological techniques, and levels of analysis from all the social sciences can be usefully acquired by students.

Within the group, there are two divergent approaches. In the first, there is emphasis on the concepts and methods of the social sciences; in the second, the focus is on social and political controversies and the values which underlie them, with the social sciences as such playing a minor role.

One statement giving a rationale for the approach has been made by Professor James R. Scarritt of the University of Colorado Political Science faculty:

> I believe there is an underlying unity in human social behavior; therefore, I would advocate a unified social science approach to teaching at the pre-college level. I view the political system as the analytical subsystem of society which is crucial for the selection and attainment of societal goals and the study of it would thus deserve an important place in the integrated social science curriculum. Political science concepts and theories should play an important part in the exploration of how the polity relates to the other subsystems--economics, cultural, societal, etc.--as well as in the explanations of the internal workings of the political system itself; but always with an emphasis on their relationships to concepts and theories from the other social science disciplines.

Some of the project materials that most clearly represent this view are those of the Center for Study of Instruction (see reference 1, below); Education

Development Center (reference 2); Educational Research Council of America (3); University of Illinois (6); Janesville Social Studies Project (6); Minneapolis Public Schools: Work Opportunity Center (9); and the University of Minnesota (10).

A rationale for the second approach, giving much less emphasis to the social sciences as such, has been made by Professor Richard B. Wilson, also of the University of Colorado Political Science faculty:

> In spite of the Behavioral Revolution, there remain a substantial number of political scientists who doubt the existence of an underlying unity in human social behavior. At least many of them doubt that the behavioral uniformities which have thus far been identified can capture the essence of political life or provide a grand design for comprehending and shaping the polity. Political scientists of this persuasion are more inclined to hold with the view of Oliver (stated above) that central to the political process are a set of values designed to maximize individual choice and to facilitate personal fulfillment. Because a polity appears to these people as necessarily assuming the form of a social service and regulatory state, they would emphasize the central and instrumental role of legal government in realizing these values. Such persons would not reject or omit the empirical results of behavioral research, but they would insist on arranging the output around the central value issues of the time rather than viewing this output as a self-sufficient architectonic structure for explaining the social universe.

Project materials which most clearly reflect this view are those of Harvard University (4); and Utah State University (14).

The full list of 14 project materials packages follows.

1. Center for Study of Instruction: The Social Sciences: Concepts & Values
   Grades K-9, Organizer: Social Science Concepts & Values
2. Education Development Center: Social Studies Curriculum Program
   Grades 7-10, Organizer: Thematic variations of man's emerging culture
3. Educational Research Council of America: Social Science Program
   Grades K-9, Organizer: Sequential and cumulative development basic concepts
4. Harvard University: Social Studies Project
   Grades 9-12, Organizer: Public issues
5. Illinois, University of: Social Science Curriculum Study Center
   Grades 8-12 (9-12), Organizer: Basic, universal concepts and generalizations
6. Janesville Social Studies Project: Man Through Time To Space
   Grades 10-12, Organizer: Basic concepts and understanding of the structure of social science disciplines

7. Kent State University: Focus on Inner City Social Studies
   Grades K-12, Organizer: Change and how to implement it. Much of the material is designed to be useful as "plug in" units.

8. Milwaukee Public Schools: An Experimental Course Entitled "An Introduction to the Social Sciences & Humanities"
   Grade 7, Organizer: The matrix of individual and social values

9. Minneapolis Public Schools, Work Opportunity Center: Task Force on Minority Cultures
   Grades 4,5,7,9,12, Organizer: Unity and commonality of human values. Micro-units developed for purpose of enrichment of existing social studies curriculum

10. Minnesota, University of: Project Social Studies
    Grades K-12, Organizer: Sequential development of content, generalizations, skills and attitudes with culture as unifying theme

11. New York Regional Laboratory: Center for Urban Education
    Grades 3-8, Organizer: The strengthening and improvement of inner city environment and education

12. New York State University at Buffalo: The Use of Electronic Computers to Improve Individualization of Instruction through Unit Teaching
    Grades K-12, Organizer: Data bank of computerized units. Units developed thus far are useful for enrichment

13. San Francisco State College: Taba Curriculum Development Project
    Grades 1-8, Organizer: Sequential development of knowledge, cognitive skills, academic and social skills, and attitudes and values.

14. Utah State University Social Studies Project: A Curriculum Focused on Thinking Reflectively About Public Issues
    Grades 9-12, Organizer: Concepts and understanding of societal conflict.

Project Materials Using a Discipline (except Political Science) as Organizer of Social Science Concepts

A second approach to the organization is to use the generalizations and methodologies of one discipline to give direction to the explanation and use of concepts from a number of disciplines. History, geography, and anthropology have been used in this way.

Examples are the University of Georgia Anthropological material (15); Experiment in Economic Education (16); San Jose State College's ECON 12 (19); Association of American Geographers (16); Amherst Project (23) and Carnegie-Mellon (24,25,26,27,28,29,30), which both use history; and the American Sociological Association (32).

The full list of 17 materials packages follows.

15. Georgia, University of: Anthropology Curriculum Project
    Grades 1-12, Organizer: Anthropology

16. Experiment in Economic Education: Our Working World
    Grades 1-6, Organizer: Economics

17. Joint Council on Economic Education: Developmental Economics Education Program
    Grades K-12, Organizer: Economics. The materials are primarily units emanating from cooperating school districts which can be used supplementally.

18. Ohio University, Economics Curricular Materials for Secondary Schools: Economics Curricular Material
    Grades 9-12 (one semester), Organizer: Economics

19. San Jose State College: ECON 12
    Grades 10-12 (one semester), Organizer: Economics

20. Association of American Geographers: High School Geography Project
    Grades 9-12 (one year), Organizer: Geography

21. Providence, Rhode Island Social Studies Curriculum Project: Social Studies Curriculum
    Grades K-12, Organizer: Geography and History

22. Amherst College: Basic Concepts in History and the Social Sciences
    Grades 10-12 (one year), Organizer: History

23. Amherst Project: Committee on Study of History
    Grades 9-12, Organizer: History

24. Carnegie-Mellon University: Education Systems Research Project
    Grades 9-12, Organizer: History. Supplemental and enrichment units

25. Carnegie-Mellon University: Slow Learner Project
    Grade 8, Organizer: History

26. Carnegie-Mellon University: Social Studies Curriculum Project (American History)
    Grade 11, Organizer: History

27. Carnegie-Mellon University: Social Studies Curriculum Project (Comparative Political Systems)
    Grades 9-12 (one semester), Organizer: History

28. Carnegie-Mellon University: Social Studies Curriculum Project (Humanities in Three Cities)
    Grade 12 (one semester), Organizer: History

29. Carnegie-Mellon University: Social Studies Curriculum Project (Shaping of Western Society)
    Grade 10 (one semester), Organizer: History

30. Carnegie-Mellon University: Social Studies Curriculum Project (Tradition & Change in Four Societies)
    Grade 10 (one semester), Organizer: History

31. Northwestern University, World History Project: Global History of Man
Grades 10-12 (one year), Organizer: History

32. American Sociological Association: Sociological Resources for the Social Studies
Grades 9-12, Organizer: Sociology. Self-contained episodes or units intended for enrichment

Project Materials with Primary Political Science Content

Ten materials packages in which political science provides much of the content are listed below.

33. Hartford Public Schools: Hartford Programmed Materials, American Liberties, Port Royal
Grades K-12, Organizer: American Political Behavior. Units are generally compensatory and designed to cope with inner city stress and tensions.

34. Indiana, University of: High School Curriculum Center in Government
Grades 9-12 (one year), Organizer: American Political Behavior

35. Tufts University: Lincoln Filene Center Elementary Social Studies Program
Grades 1-6, Organizer: Intergroup Relations

36. Tufts University: Lincoln Filene Center Secondary Social Studies Program
Grades 9-12, Organizer: Governing Process Model

37. California, University of, at Los Angeles: The Committee on Civic Education
Grades 4-12, Organizer: American Political Behavior and Constitutional Law

38. Constitutional Rights Foundation: Bill of Rights
Grades 6-12, Organizer: Constitutional Law. The material is designed primarily to supplement traditional course offerings

39. Law in American Society: Justice in Urban America
Grades 5,7,8,9,11-12, Organizer: Public Law. Material has been developed for a one semester course plus a variety of ad hoc supplementary units.

40. Foreign Policy Association: International Studies in Elementary & Secondary Schools
Grades 9-12, Organizer: International Relations. The development of curricular material has only been an incidental consideration in this program

41. North Central Association: Foreign Relations Project
Grades 9-12, Organizer: International Relations. This project is closed and the supplementary material which it produced is dated.

42. World Law Fund:
Grades 11-12, Organizer: International Relations (peace through world order)

Area Studies

43. Carnegie-Mellon University: Project Africa
Grades 7-9 (one semester), Organizer: History

44. California, University of, at Berkeley: Asian Studies Inquiry Program
Grades 9-12 (one semester), Organizer: History. Although the materials are designed to be used as an area study, individual pamphlets could supplement an existing course.

45. Texas University: Development of Guidelines & Resource Materials on Latin America
Grades 1-12, Organizer: Culture. Materials designed for enrichment units

46. World Studies Inquiry Series:
Grades 7-12 (one year), Organizer: Social science concepts

Analysis and Evaluation of Political Science Content

One widely accepted definition of political science is that it is the systematic study of social processes through which valued resources are authoritatively allocated. From such a systematic study of these social processes students should hopefully gain the capacity to make use of concepts, the ability to make valid generalizations, and the skill to diagnose significant political problems. Each of these attributes are necessary to select from available alternatives appropriate and equitable solutions.

The Political Science Advisory Panel to the California Statewide Social Sciences Committee has suggested certain cognitive and affective goals which it is important for students to achieve by the end of the K-12 social studies sequence. They are:

"1. Awareness of
a. Complexity of public issues
b. Tentativeness of policy decisions (no final solutions)
c. The shifting dividing line between public and private acts
d. The rules of the (political) game(s)
e. The continuing tension between the status quo and change, conformity and deviation, habit and innovation.

2. Knowledge of
a. Manifold sources and forms of conflict
b. Basic processes of conflict resolution (or nonresolution) and consensus formation
c. Significant properties of political systems and nature of systematic comparison
d. Qualities of political community and government which do and do not inspire a sense of 'legitimacy.'

3. Appreciation for
   a. Wide variations in political forms
   b. Nature and mechanisms of membership in a polity
   c. Necessity and kinds of law, limitations on law
   d. Tolerance of ambiguity
   e. Need to 'lose' politically on occasion
   f. A non-U.S. perspective on one's own institutions
   g. The importance of freedom of choice within certain constraints."[16]

The California Committee's list of desirable attributes supplies a useful check list. To what extent can we assume that these characteristics will be fostered by the materials which have been developed by the listed curriculum projects? What would a student know about the politics of man after a total immersion in all of these curriculum materials?

The objectives of these projects which emphasize analysis and resolution of value conflict as organizing themes (Harvard University (4), and Utah State University (14) would seem to implement awareness of complexity of public issues (1a) and knowledge of manifold sources and forms of conflict (2a) on the California list. The hoped for awareness and knowledge might never be realized, however, in certain kinds of communities. For those areas where there is general antipathy to certain value positions, great care would have to be taken in the selection of content so that it could satisfy both the general objectives of the approach while avoiding excessive community conflicts.

Awareness of the tentativeness of policy decisions (1b); knowledge of basic processes of conflict resolution (2b); appreciation for the necessity and kinds of law, and limitations on law (3c); and the importance of freedom of choice within certain constraints (3g) are all well explained and developed by a number of the projects. The Kent State University materials (7) deal explicitly with change and how to implement it. The Law In American Society (39) and University of California at Los Angeles (37) projects deal with the uses of law as well as the appropriate mechanisms by which it can be changed. Constitutional Rights Foundation (38) materials focus on both the rights and responsibilities inherent in American citizenship; in these materials, students are guided to discover the ways in which Supreme Court decisions can alter and expand basic rights over time. The audiences to which much of this material is directed are primarily inner city and disadvantaged youth. It would be useful to have similar materials which would satisfy the needs of average and able students in a wide variety of environments.

Awareness of the shifting dividing line between public and private acts (1c), knowledge of the significant properties of political systems and nature of systematic comparison (2c), and a knowledge of the qualities of political community and government which do and do not inspire a sense of legitimacy (2d) are generally examined in several of the packages. San Jose State's ECON 12 (19), Carnegie-Mellon's Comparative Political Systems (27) and portions of the University of Illinois (5), and University of Minnesota (10) materials deal with these concepts at length. With the exception of the University of Minnesota which does have some remedial units, these materials are primarily designed for average and able students. Inner city youth would benefit if material designed for them developed these themes.

The University of Indiana (34) as well as Tufts University (36) have both generated curricula which should lead to an awareness of the rules of the political game (1d), appreciation for the nature and mechanisms of membership in a polity (3b), tolerance of ambiguity (3d), and the need to "lose" politically on occasion (3e). The Indiana one year course was designed for able students while the Tufts project offers a wide range of materials primarily useful for non-college bound.

The Georgia University Anthropology project (15), Amherst College (22), Amherst Project (23), Carnegie-Mellon University (25,26,27,28,29,30), the Association of American Geographers (20), and the American Sociological Association (32) materials all offer some interesting perspectives with which to develop an awareness of the continuing tension between the status quo and change, conformity and deviation, and habit and innovation (1e). The materials from each of these projects are primarily geared to the capabilities of average and able students.

Appreciation for wide variations in political forms (3a) and a non-U.S. perspective on one's own institutions (3f) are particularly implemented by units from University of California at Berkeley (44), Carnegie-Mellon University (27, 28,29,30,43), University of Illinois (5), University of Minnesota (10), the University of Texas (45), World Law Fund (42), and the World Studies Inquiry Series (46). Again, with the exception of the World Studies Inquiry Series which is a "slow learner" package and a small portion from the University of Minnesota, the curricula from these projects are geared to the abilities and

capabilities of average students.

To take yet another route in exploring the extent to which material of concern to political science has been developed, one can look at some of the "traditional" fields of political science--American Political Behavior, Constitutional Law and Theory, Comparative Governments, and International Relations.

There is, of course, a larger proportion of material devoted to American Political Behavior than has been developed for the other areas. Much of what is said about American Political Behavior has been structured so that the student can extrapolate and draw analogies from concepts and generalizations developed in this context to other, broader frames of references.

Constitutional Law and related topics have received reasonably good coverage although, as stated before, many of these packages are aimed at limited audiences. Only minimal treatment has been accorded theory as political philosophy. Many of the packages do have a large, normative component, however, which is diffused throughout the curricula.

Several of the projects have generated material which is devoted to a study of Comparative Governments. The governments treated tend to be the obvious ones--Great Britain, U.S.S.R., Japan, China, and India. Latin America and Africa probably do not have extensive enough coverage although three projects--Carnegie-Mellon University: Project Africa (43), University of Texas (45) and World Studies Inquiry Series (46)--are devoted entirely to those areas and other projects have units on them: Carnegie-Mellon University (30), Educational Research Council of America (3), University of Georgia (15), Harvard University (4), University of Illinois (5), Joint Council on Economic Education (17), Kent State University (7), University of Minnesota (10), North Central Association (41), Northwestern University (31), Providence, Rhode Island (21). Developing areas receive still less coverage, and only a few of the projects deal with the ideological underpinnings of totalitarian systems.

International Relations as a field is given very limited attention. The World Law Fund (42) is a major project whose materials have this orientation and the Foreign Policy Relations project (40) is concerned with this area, although their curriculum output is small. Unfortunately, some excellent material from the North Central Association (41) is now very dated.

Although there seems to be a general philosophical acceptance of the validity of preparing materials which are designed to help minority cultures develop a

better self-concept, and cultural identity and pride, there are very few curricula of this kind. The Hartford Public Schools (33) and Minneapolis Public Schools (9) have both prepared units for this purpose as have Tufts University (35,36) and University of Georgia (15), and Texas University (45).

Summary Comments

It might be interesting to speculate briefly on the extent to which the "new social studies" materials are better than the curricula which have generally been presented in the traditional social sciences. The content itself, although certainly more extensive, may not be so very different from older, more traditional content. There is a major difference in the techniques which are being employed to teach the content, however. The student of the new materials should get a more comprehensive grasp of the alternative uses to which content can and should be put. He may add to his repertoire an understanding of some structures or social science frameworks with which he can organize and manipulate the data which confronts him. He should have an awareness of certain basic concepts and generalizations with which political phenomena can be made intellegible. Finally, he should have the ability to use source material and to evaluate, analyze, and generate hypotheses.

Only longitudinal studies can tell us whether the materials thus far produced have succeeded in developing young people who will continue to be excited enough about political activity to continue to use these cognitive skills and affective attitudes so that they can be more effective participants in the political process.

After extensive study of the project materials, one feels hopeful enough that the new directions should be continued so that the ragged edges and the incomplete areas can be filled in to make an optimum whole.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Bernard Crick, The American Science of Politics..(Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1959) pp. 69-70.

[2]Frank R. Sorauf, Perspectives on Political Science. (Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Books, 1966) p.13.

[3]Leroy N. Rieselback, The Behavioral Approach to the Study of Politics. (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Foundation, 1969) p. 75.

[4]"Report of the Political Science Advisory Panel to the Statewide Social Sciences Study Committee" (California State Department of Education, December, 1967) p. 6.

[5]Donald W. Robinson, Promising Practices in Civic Education. (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1967) p. 6.

[6]Herbert C. Kelman, "Education for the Concept of a Global Society," Social Education. Vol. XXXII, No. 7 (November, 1968).

[7]Fr. Thomas Cassidy, S.C.J., Political Science in the New Social Studies. A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of the Catholic University of America, (Washington D.C.: July, 1970) p.2.

[8]Jerome S. Bruner, The Process of Education. (New York: Vintage Press, 1960) p. 8.

[9]Ibid. pp. 1-20.

[10]James P. Shaver and Harold Berlak, eds. Democracy, Pluralism, and the Social Studies. (Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968) pp. 17-42.

[11]Ibid. p. 35.

[12]John J. Patrick, Political Socialization of American Youth: A Review of Research with Implications for Secondary School Social Studies. (Bloomington, Indiana: High School Curriculum Center in Government, March 1967) p. 65.

[13]Ibid. p. 71.

[14]Benjamin S. Bloom, et al. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Cognitive Domain. (New York: David McKay Co., 1956).

[15]David S. Krathwohl, et al. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Affective Domain. (New York: David McKay Co., 1956).

[16]"Report of the Political Science Advisory Panel" op. cit., pp. 11-12.